REMARKS

Claims **13-21** and **27** are pending in the application.

Claims **13-21** and **27**stand rejected.

Claims **13-14, 16-17** and **27** have been amended.

Claims **1-12** and **20-26** have been cancelled.

Claims **28-29** have been added.

Formal Matters

The disclosure was objected to for containing embedded hyperlinks and/or other forms of browser-executable codes. Applicants have amended the specification to remove the objected items, and so believe this issue to be addressed.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 13, 14, 16-18 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawafuji, et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,999,536 (Kawafuji). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as the limitations of claim 20 (which stands rejected as being unpatentable over Kawafuji and further in view of Ciscon, et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,812,779 (Ciscon)) and claim 21 (which stands rejected as being unpatentable over Kawafuji and further in view of Zadikian, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,631,134 (Zadikian)) have been amended into independent claims 13, 17 and 27, as well as other amendments having been made.

While not conceding that the cited references qualify as prior art, but instead to expedite prosecution, Applicants have chosen to respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection as follows. Applicants reserve the right, for example, in a continuing application, to establish that the cited references, or other references cited now or hereafter, do not qualify as prior art as to an invention embodiment previously, currently, or subsequently claimed.

In order for a claim to be rendered invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the subject matter of the claim as a whole would have to be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. *See* 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). This requires: (1) the references must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations; (2) there must be some teaching, suggestion or motivation to combine references either in the references themselves or in the knowledge of the art; and (3) there must be a reasonable expectation of success. *See* MPEP 2143; MPEP 2143.03; *In re Rouffet*, 149 F.3d 1350, 1355-56 (Fed. Cir. 1998).

As noted, Applicants have amended independent claims 13 and 27 in the manner of claim 17, which now reads as follows:

17. A network comprising:

a first circuit switch having a first interface, the first interface having assigned thereto a first identifier;

a second circuit switch having a second interface, the second interface having assigned thereto a second identifier;

a plurality of memory locations in said first circuit switch containing a first table, the first table including each of said first identifier and said second identifier;

a plurality of memory locations in said second circuit switch containing a second table,

said second table including each of said first identifier and said second identifier; and

a link coupling said first interface to said second interface, wherein

said first table and said second table each comprise

an entry indicating a function of said link, and

an entry indicating a predetermined number of contiguous frames that may be transmitted over said link.

As also noted, Applicants respectfully note that independent claims 13 and 17 have been amended to recite, among other limitations, substantially similar limitations to those presented above.

By contrast, Kawafuji is directed to:

"In a router having a routing section for performing routing on the basis of a routing table and an ARP (address resolution protocol) table to transmit a received packet to a destination, and adapted to connect a plurality of local area networks (LANs), to realize high-speed routing, the IP addresses and MAC addresses of the terminal apparatuses in the LANs directly connected to the router are stored in a memory table in correspondence with the interfaces information to which the LANs are connected, together with the IP addresses of the terminal apparatuses in a LAN connected to the router through another router, the MAC address of another router, and the interfaces information to which another router

is connected, which are stored in correspondence with each other. When a packet determination section determines that a received packet satisfies predetermined conditions, and a registration determination section determines that destination IP address of the packet is registered in the memory table, a second routing section specially designed for packets satisfying the predetermined conditions reads out information corresponding to the IP address from the memory table, updates the MAC address of the received packet with the information, and outputs the packet." (Kawafuji; Abstract)

By further contrast, Ciscon is directed to:

"A data management and distribution system has been described that includes router processes for controlling data communications between child processes running on computers connected by a network. Preferably, a router process runs on each computer, with the application processes running on the computer connected directly to the router process. As a result, all interprocess communications must pass through the routers. Each router process includes a connection table listing its connections with all other router and application processes, as well as an interest table listing the type of objects that each of the other processes are interested in receiving. Data communication is accomplished by an application process providing an object to its local router, which then distributes the object to all other interested routers. The object includes a destination list indicating which processes are to receive the object. Thus, with the

use of routers, application processes that need to communicate with each other over a network need not know the intricate details (such as the communications protocol used, the exact address of the receiving process, etc.) involved in transmitting information. By placing the burden of managing the network communications on the local routers, the complexity of the application code is reduced since it has only a single connection to its local router." (Ciscon; Abstract)

By still further contrast, Zadikian is directed to:

> "A method is provided to allocate bandwidth from a first node to a second node in a optical network. The method begins by accepting a request from an end-user, who requests a virtual path between the first node and the second node. The first and second nodes are ones of a number of such nodes. Each one of the nodes is coupled to at least one other node by at least one of a number of optical links. The nodes and links form the optical network. The virtual path has a bandwidth requirement associated therewith. Next, the service provider determines an amount of bandwidth available between the first and the second nodes. The service provider then allocates at least a portion of the amount of bandwidth available between the first and second nodes equal to the bandwidth requirement, so long as the bandwidth requirement is not greater than the amount of bandwidth available between the first and second nodes." (Zadikian; Abstract)

Even if Kawafuji, Ciscon and Zadikian were taken as teaching the elements purportedly taught thereby, in the manner posited in the Office Action (a point which Applicants do not concede), the Office Action understandably fails to state any manner in which Kawafuji, Ciscon and Zadikian might be combined, not even approaching the question of whether the references could be successfully combined or how such a combination might make the claimed invention obvious (points which Applicants also do not concede).

Claims 15 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawafuji, et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,999,536 (Kawafuji) and further in view of Gruber, et al., European Patent No. 0924952 (Gruber). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, in light of the amendments to independent claims 13, 17 and 27.

Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawafuji, et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,999,536 (Kawafuji) and further in view of Ciscon, et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,812,779 (Ciscon). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as moot, as claim 20 has been cancelled.

Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawafuji, et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,999,536 (Kawafuji) and further in view of Zadikian, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,631,134 (Zadikian). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as moot, as claim 21 has been cancelled.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action fails to present a *prima facie* case of obviousness of amended independent claims 13, 17 and 27, and all claims dependent upon them, and that they are in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore request the Examiner's reconsideration of the rejections of those claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 512-439-5084.

If any extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) are required in order for this submission to be considered timely, Applicant hereby petitions for such extensions. Applicant also hereby authorizes that any fees due for such extensions or any other fee associated with this submission, as specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17, be charged to deposit account 502306.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on **October 9, 2007**.

Attorney for Applicants — Date of Signature: 10/9/07

Respectfully submitted,

Samuel G. Campbell, III
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 42,381
Telephone: (512) 439-5084
Facsimile: (512) 439-5099